

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 29 2004

PATENT

Attorney Docket No. 33983/400100

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Monteverde)
Serial Number: 10/064,944) Group Art Unit: 2171
Filing Date: August 30, 2002) Confirmation No.: 3631
For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR) Examiner: Nguyen, Cindy
PREDICTING ADDITIONAL)
SEARCH RESULTS OF A)
COMPUTERIZED DATABASE)
SEARCH USER BASED ON AN)
INITIAL SEARCH QUERY)

Date: September 29, 2004

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent
and Trademark Office, Technology Center 2100,
facsimile number 703-746-7239, on September
29, 2004.

RoseAnn White 9-29-04
RoseAnn White Date

Mail Stop Non-fee Amendments
Commissioner of Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REMARKS IN RESPONSE TO FIRST OFFICE ACTION

Dear Sir:

This Remarks is in response to the Office Action mailed July 6, 2004, for the above
captioned patent application.

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application and have been rejected.

Substance of the Interview begins on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks begin on page 3 of this paper.

SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

The applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for speaking on the telephone with the applicant's undersigned attorney on September 14, 2004. In that telephone conversation, the applicant's attorney and the Examiner discussed how the claims of the applicant's present application are different in view of the cited references of record, either alone or in combination. Specifically, the Examiner agreed with the applicant's attorney that at least the limitations "relating each of said topical categories with other said topical categories contained within said topical category database," and "associating said initial search term to any topical categories related to said initial topical category thereby creating related categories," are not taught by Li, Zimmerman, and/or Mallon, either alone or in combination, upon which the Examiner's § 103(a) rejections relies. The applicant's attorney further directed the Examiner to the Internet site <<http://www.7search.com>> to view a working embodiment of the claimed invention to further emphasize the differences of the present application in view of the cited references of record.

Regarding the Examiner's Interview Summary, mailed on September 23, 2004, the applicant respectfully asserts that the Summary is inaccurate in that the applicant and Examiner further agreed that the limitation "relating each of said topical categories with other said topical categories contained within said topical category database" is not taught by Li, Zimmerman, and/or Mallon, either alone or in combination.